

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 14, 16-20 and 23-28 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 14 and 23 are amended herein. Support for the amendments can be found in the originally filed specification. It is believed this change does not involve any introduction of new matter. No additional claims fee is believed to be due. Consequently, entry of this change is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 14, 16, 19-20, 23-24 and 27-28 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al. (US 5543206) in view of Buell et al. (US 5569234). Claims 17 and 18 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Austin et al. in view of Buell et al. and further in view of Willey et al. (US 5494736). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections, as the references do not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations of the present claims, as required in MPEP 2143.03. Specifically, the combination of Austin et al., Buell et al. and Willey et al. does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, a disposable absorbent article that comprises a backsheet comprising a plastic film and a nonwoven web, wherein the plastic film is disposed only in a containment assembly area of the disposable absorbent article, and the nonwoven web is joined to the outer surface of said plastic film such that the nonwoven web covers the entire outer surface of the plastic film and is disposed on the containment assembly area and said side panel areas of the disposable absorbent article, as required in Applicants' amended claims. Moreover, the combination of Austin et al., Buell et al. and Willey et al. does not teach a disposable absorbent article comprising a pair of side panels that each comprise a securement member of a fastening system, wherein the securement members are utilized to engage the nonwoven web, as recited in Applicants' claim 14.

Appl. No. 09/297,774
Docket No. JA-179
Amdt. dated May 1, 2013
Reply to Office Action mailed on February 1, 2013
Customer No. 27752

For at least these reasons, Applicants contend that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established, the claimed invention is not obvious in view of the cited references, and the rejections should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied references. In view of the amendments presented herein, reconsideration of this application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By /Andrew J. Mueller/
Andrew J. Mueller
Registration No. 56,774
(513) 983-6851

Date: May 1, 2013
Customer No. 27752